









A

FEW REMARKS

ON THE

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONDITION

OF

BRITISH CATHOLICS.

BY THE

EARL OF ARUNDEL AND SURREY.

LONDON:

C. DOLMAN, 61, NEW BOND STREET.

MDCCCXLVII.

~~~~~  
PRINTED AT THE METROPOLITAN CATHOLIC PRINTING OFFICE,  
9, RUPERT STREET, HAYMARKET.  
~~~~~


FEW REMARKS, &c.

THE active and vigorous mind of the British public is agitated, at this moment, to an extraordinary extent, by various questions of religious controversy ; as if worked upon by invisible agency, the members of the Church, and every community of professing Christians ; and the advocates of each degree of ascetic or rational development, appear to put forth all their strength and all their ability, each in the cause, (as he believes), of truth.

In this common struggle for the advancement of the cause for which God delivered Himself, in human form, a living sacrifice ; the Holy Catholic Church finds herself in constant collision with those separated brethren of various creeds, who deny her exclusive possession of the Faith necessary for eternal salvation.

Differing with each other in much that regards faith, discipline, and practice, all these Religious Communi-

ties are agreed in one particular, that in the Catholic Church, errors prevail, of such importance, as to render her claim to their attention obviously absurd.

But it is not with the Theological question that I wish to deal. I wish humbly to offer a brief exposition of the views which, in my opinion, a Catholic at this time should hold, as regards the political prospects of his Religion. I wish to show what is the position of the Catholic Church in England and Scotland—what her claims—what her duties.

I believe her position to be misunderstood, her claims misrepresented, and her duties, that is, the duties incumbent upon her pastors, and upon her children, to be absolutely unknown to those without her pale.

I am but too well aware how little I am fitted for such a task. I undertake it because I think it probable that many of my friends, cherishing opinions at variance with my own upon this all important subject, may be induced to read as the work of a friend or acquaintance, that which, from one unknown to them, however surpassing in ability and execution, would be carelessly thrown aside. I should, perhaps add, that for the opinions expressed I alone am responsible. I shall, however, submit what I am now writing to proper Ecclesiastical authority, in order that I may be quite secure from giving any erroneous representation of the doctrine or discipline of the Catholic Church. I will also state here, once for all, that if I say any thing which calls forth an angry feeling in the heart of any one opposed to me, I most deeply regret it. To many members of the Established Church of this country, I am

bound by the closest ties of affection and intimacy. My heart is innocent of any other feeling than love for all, and where I am constrained by the very nature of the subject, to insist upon the necessity of communion with the Catholic Church as a means of salvation : it must never be forgotten that, in cases of "invincible ignorance," the Church pronounces no positive opinion as to the limits of God's mercy.

What, indeed, would be the feelings of my heart if I did not believe that many would be saved, who are not, visibly, at least, in communion with the Church.

Let me here explain the term "invincible ignorance," an expression calculated to raise within our rebellious nature, that pride from which no descendant of Adam is totally free. Invincible ignorance unfortunately may be the lot of the most learned, as well as of the least instructed, as the physician not unfrequently discovers in the many forms of mental derangements, that the mind is diseased but upon one point, but one string of the lyre out of tune ; so it may be that the greatest mind may be utterly deficient in that fine organ which in him may be necessary for the admission of faith.

It is not for the human heart, in such an instance, to pronounce a final sentence ; nor has in such circumstances the Church of Christ declared herself commissioned to decide. But religious controversy is not my object in this pamphlet. I approach it with reluctance, and only when obliged to do so through its necessary connection with the political view which I propose to take.

I am a Catholic, and, of course, in communion with the

See of Rome. The Bishop of Rome, commonly called the Pope, is the successor of St. Peter, through a long series of bishops. To St. Peter our Lord gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven, the commission to bind and loose. He gave the same commission to the other Apostles collectively, but he gave it to St. Peter alone. And circumstances mentioned in the holy Scriptures, show a primacy, or a superior authority, to have been given to St. Peter. The fact is confirmed by the tradition and the authority of the Church, by the testimony of ages. The commission given by our blessed Lord to St. Peter, was not to cease with him. It was to continue to him and his successors to the end of the world. To be in communion with the successor of St. Peter, whether he be at Rome or any where else, is to be a member of the holy Catholic Church. In that Church, eternal salvation is promised to those who obey her; who obey her when, through her ministers, she exerts her due authority, who lead chaste and pure lives, free from sin, free from murder, fornication, the lusts of the flesh, injustice, and other mortal sins, who keep the commandments, or who having sinned, sincerely repent and obtain pardon, and after that persevere to the end. The members of that Church, leading such lives, will be saved to all eternity through the merits of Christ, their *only* Redeemer. Such is Catholic doctrine.

My first duty is to my Creator. I have other duties, subordinate to the first duty, but strictly compatible with it. As an Englishman, I have duties to this country, and to its government, that is, to the Queen, the House of Peers, and the House of Commons, the three estates of

the realm which form the government of Great Britain. I have duties to my fellow-citizens.

But my position is peculiar. The established religion of the country is not that which I profess. I am looked upon with suspicion by my fellow-citizens—not as a man, but as a Catholic—for I am supposed to owe to the Pope an allegiance incompatible with that allegiance which I owe to the Queen. My object, therefore, is to prove that my allegiance to the Pope is not only compatible with perfect loyalty, but such as to make me a better subject of the Queen, and that no jealousy need exist, because I owe a *spiritual* allegiance to the Head of the Catholic Church. I believe that many of my fellow-citizens have formed erroneous views of my religion, not merely in its dogmatic form, but also of the practical duties which the Pope, and the bishops, and the priests are bound to perform as shepherds of the flock of Christ.

I wish also to enter upon the claims, which, as a subject, and a fellow-citizen, I have upon the government and my fellow-countrymen. I owe them duties, and they owe me duties. Let both be fulfilled.

I must here observe, that although for the sake of convenience I use the singular term, it is not for myself that I speak. In the things of this world I am rich; I speak comparatively, and as regards the immense bulk of the Catholics of the kingdom. In my position, I can secure those blessings which are denied to my poorer brethren: I can have, if I wish it, a chaplain to myself, my own chapel. I am not likely, in the ordinary course of things, to be the inmate of a workhouse, or of a prison. I have

received that degree of education which qualifies me for the ordinary duties of life. I can provide instruction for my children. I can pay, and do pay, the taxes necessary for the government of the country, without any material restriction upon my own means. Such is not the case with my poorer brethren. But when I speak as for myself, it is really their cause which I plead. I ask for the fulfilment of those duties towards them which the government and their fellow-citizens owe to them. I ask it in the first place with simplicity and humility, ready to receive as a boon what I know to be my right. If refused, I demand it in the name of justice and fairness. If it is not just, if it is not fair, I do not require it. Try it by that test.

If still refused, I urge my demand, in peace, with good will and perfect friendship to all; but I urge it with earnestness, with perseverance, and I place my trust in God, Who will measure out to each his rewards, and his punishments, not according to the caprice and the prejudices of man, with mercy, indeed, yet with severe justice.

For the sake of convenience I divide my subject into three heads :

1st. That my spiritual allegiance to the Pope is not only compatible with perfect loyalty, but such as to make me a better subject of the Queen, and that no jealousy need exist on the part of the British Government and my fellow-citizens, because I owe a spiritual allegiance elsewhere.

2dly. I wish to explain the duties which are incumbent upon the Pope, the bishops, and the priests of the Catholic Church, in their relations with the laity of that Church.

And 3dly. The reciprocal duties which both Catholics and Protestants, fellow-citizens of the same state, owe to each other.

1st. With respect to my spiritual allegiance—all power is from God alone. He is the Creator of the world, the author and maker of every thing in it, from His noblest work, the soul of man, made after His own likeness, and formed for His own society, down to the animalculæ which baffle the keenest sight bestowed by Him on man. His commands are, therefore, to be implicitly obeyed. This is a fact acknowledged by all men, by the love and gratitude of some, the fear of others. The question is, How are we to obtain the knowledge of His will? In the plenitude of His wisdom and of His infinite goodness, He has directed us to His Church as the instrument of our instruction, and has commanded us to hear and to obey her.

What, then, is her teaching with reference to the obedience we owe to the government (of whatever nature that may be), under which He has seen fit that we should be placed by birth or by adoption?

Pope Innocent III. even while asserting the dignity of the priesthood against the Emperor of Constantinople, who, by his conduct had subjected the patriarch to an insulting humiliation—writes^(a)

“Non negamus, quin præcellat Imperator in temporalibus illis duntaxat qui ab eo suscipiunt temporalia. Sed Pontifex in spiritualibus antecellit: quæ tanto sunt temporalibus digniora quanto anima præfertur corpori:”—

(a) I am indebted to the kindness of a lay Catholic friend for the following quotations.

These words are inserted in the Body of the canon law, Extr. de Major. et obed. *Solitæ benignitatis*.

St. Thomas Aquinas on the question whether Christians are bound to obey the secular powers, states distinctly that they are.

“Ordo autem justitiæ requirit, ut inferiores superioribus obediant: aliter enim non posset humanarum rerum status conservari. Et ideo per fidem Christi non excusantur fideles, quin principibus sæcularibus obedire teneantur. And further on he says, that this obedience is due by the divine law:—Et tamen ex lege divina homo tenetur homini obedire.” Secund. 2dæ. Quæst. 104. art. 6.

In another place St. Thomas speaks of both powers together, and the measure of obedience due to each.

“Potestas spiritualis et sæcularis utraque deducitur a potestate divina: et ideo intantum sæcularis potestas est sub spirituali, inquantum est ei a Deo supposita, scilicet in his, quæ ad salutem animæ pertinent, et ideo in his magis est obediendum potestati spirituali quam sæculari. In his autem quæ ad bonum civile pertinent, est magis obediendum potestati sæculari quam spirituali, secundum illud Matth. xxii. Reddite quæ sunt Cæsaris Cæsari.”—2 Sent. *ad. fin*,

The Church, in the council of Constance, condemned the following propositions of Wycliffe:

- “Nullus est Dominus civilis, nullus est prælatus, nullus est Episcopus dum est in peccato mortali.
- “Populares possunt ad suum arbitrium Dominos delinquentes corrigere.”

Wycliffe condemned the principle of authority, by teaching that obedience was due only to men in a state

of grace, which was simply to overturn all government whatever. Pope Martin V. confirmed the sentence of the council by a special Bull.

Thomas Waldensis, an Englishman, writing against Wycliffe, maintains the following proposition :

“ Regia potestas cedit Sacerdotali ubi de rebus divinis agitur : Sacerdotalis vero cedit regiæ in negotiis terrenis.”—Doctr : Fid : lib. ii. c. 78.

Cornelius a Lapide, a Jesuit, in his commentary on the 13th Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, insists on the duty of civil obedience, and says :

“ Magistratibus obediendum esse dictat lex naturæ et jus gentium. And again, Dei enim minister est magistratus, ut præcessit. Unde conscientia dictat, ei quasi Dei ministro obediendum esse, et consequenter in Deum peccare illum qui ei non obedit.”

Calvin taught that human laws were not binding in conscience ; against a principle so fatal to the peace of the world, the Catholic Theologians universally exclaimed. It is a notorious fact. I shall quote on this point Suarez, who wrote against James I., and was a Jesuit. He, in his treatise on Laws, says :

“ Legislatores civiles fert leges ut minister Dei, per potestatem ab ipso acceptam : ergo obligat in conscientia ad parendum.”—Lib. iii. c. 21.

The same writer in his “Defence of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith against the Errors of the Anglican Sect,” after discussing the opinion of those who asserted the temporal authority of the Pope proceeds thus :

“Nihilominus dicendum est, reges Christianos habere potestatem civilem in suo ordine supremam, nullumque alium recognoscere directe superiorem intra eundem temporalem, seu civilem ordinem, a quo in actibus suæ potestatis per se pendeant. Unde fit, non dari in Ecclesia unum supremum principem temporalem totius Ecclesiæ, seu omnium regnorum ejus, sed tot esse quot sunt regna, seu respublicæ supremæ. Hæc est magis recepta et probata sententia inter Catholicos, quos statim referemus.”—Lib. iii. c. 5.

I give another extract from the same place, in which the writer enters with more minuteness into the question :

“Si vero posteriori modo cogitetur hæc potestas ita in habitu, ut possit exire in actum, quando libuerit, vel quando oportuerit, sic augetur odium et invidia, quia jam principes temporales non erunt supremi reges, falsumque erit Sedulii carmen ab ecclesia receptum, et celebratum satis,

Non eripit mortalia,
Qui regna dat cœlestia.

poteritque Pontifex pro libitu suo regna temporalia auferre, vel mutare, et judicia temporalium rerum, dispensationes, et similia sibi etiam ad libitum vindicare, saltem valide, nam licet fortasse non bene faceret propter perturbationem ordinis, factum nihilominus teneret, quia esset ex suprema jurisdictione, a qua inferior pendet. Hoc autem non solum odiosum est, at regum animos perturbare potest non sine causa ; verum etiam est per se incredibile, quia est contra universalem pacem Ecclesiæ, et contra universalem ac perpetuum usum ejus. Unde etiam jurisperiti qui dicunt summum Pontificem habere supremam jurisdictionem temporalem, id non admittunt. Imo in multis actibus jurisdictionis temporalis absolute negant, posse Pontificem extra ditionem suam temporalem illos usurpare, etiam valide ut communiter tradunt

Doctores in cap. *Per Venerabilem*. Qui filii sint legitimi. Ac denique si hoc modo haberet Pontifex jurisdictionem temporalem totius Ecclesiæ, non minus oporteret ipsum esse sollicitum de bono temporale regimine omnium regnorum Ecclesiæ, quam de regimine spirituali omnium Episcopatumum: nam est eadem ratio et obligatio, servata proportione, et ita procedit ratio facta, quod illa duplex sollicitudo universalis humanas vires, et capacitatem moraliter excedat, sitque contra omnem rationem et usum.”—*Ib.*

I quote next from Azpilcueta, the great doctor of Navarre, who was also Penitentiary at Rome:

“Alexander III. respondit, ad regem et non ad ecclesiam pertinere de possessionibus cognoscere: et addidit ‘Ne videamur detrahere juri regis Anglorum qui ipsarum judicium asserit ad se pertinere? Audis jurisdictionem aliquam esse, quæ ad regem Anglorum et non ad Papam pertinet? Idem Alexander declarat, extra terras ecclesiæ, non posse ad ipsum appellari a judice civili, nulla inter supremam et inferiorem facta differentia. Quin et glossa singularis tenet ab imperatore ad Papam non posse appellari, quod totus servat Christianismus.”—*Relect. cap. Novit. de Judiciis.*

The following passage is from Gonzalez, one of the Inquisition, and a Canonist:

“Nam licet verum sit, principes et omnes alios teneri parere Episcopis, et ministris Ecclesiæ in spiritualibus: tamen in temporalibus parendum esse principibus et ministris sæcularibus, recte probatur ex supradictis auctoritatibus et aliis congestis a Bellarmino, tom. i., controv: tit. 6. *de Clericis*, c. 28. Molin. de Institut., t. i., disp. 31. Valasco, consult. 110., nec ullum inconveniens est, ut quoad temporalia parent principibus, qui quoad spiritualia illis præsumunt”—*In cap. Solitæ, de Major: et obed.*

Such is the teaching of that Church to which every Catholic looks with affection, and obeys at the risk of all that is dear to man on earth. It is not left to the judgment of each individual man. No priest or bishop can take upon himself to justify disobedience to her. There is no form of religious government on earth which so strongly enforces the duty of obedience to those whom God has placed in temporal and civil authority.

And if I am told that the Catholic Church requires the first duty of her children when disputed questions arise as to the claims of spiritual and civil authority, I grant it. The preservation of the Catholic Faith in this country is owing to it. We were bound to obey God rather than man. The civil power proscribed the Catholic religion. The Catholics of the day had the courage to persevere. The Anglican Church did the same in the time of Cromwell. The Nonconformists have done the same. The Episcopal Church of Scotland defied the Presbyterians and the civil power after the revolution. The Free Church of Scotland asserts the same principle now. This is sufficient for my purpose, but I will quote from the highest authorities of the Reformed Church of England, the best and most learned of her sons. She is as unwilling as the Catholic Church to admit in such points the higher authority of the secular power, as is evident at this very time, in the struggle to prevent Dr. Hampden from being made a bishop.

I first quote from Hooker, called the judicious, and the highest authority in the Anglican Church :

“Usurpers of power, whereby we do not mean them that by violence have aspired unto places of highest authority, but them that use more authority than they did ever receive in form and manner beforementioned—for so they may do, whose titles unto the rooms of authority which they possess, no man can deny to be just and lawful: even as, contrariwise, some men’s proceedings in government have been very orderly who, notwithstanding, did not attain to be made governors without great violence and disorder—such usurpers as in the exercise of their power do more than they have been authorised to do, cannot in conscience bind any man unto obedience.”—Eccles. Pol., book viii., appendix, vol. 3, p. 574. Oxford, 1836.

My next authority shall be Thorndike, Prebendary of Westminster, and one of the commissioners for revising the Book of Common Prayer, at the Restoration, and considered the most learned of all the Anglican divines.

“The Church is endowed with no temporal right, therefore the state is endowed with no ecclesiastical right, though it hath great right in ecclesiastical matters, of which in due time. For all this right supposeth the Church already established by that power on which it standeth, and so must maintain it upon the same terms which it findeth. The homage which the Church payeth to God for the protection of the state, is, not to betray the right, founded on the express charter of God, to powers subsisting by the works of His mediate providence: but to subdue subjects to that obedience for conscience, which the state exacteth by force. For there is necessarily this difference between the principles upon which the Church and civil communities subsist. The charter of the one is revealed by grace; the others stand upon the laws of nature and nations, and acts, which Providence enables men to do agreeable to the same. Therefore as no state stands by the Gospel, so no right settled by the Gospel can belong to any state, or person, as a member of any state.

Besides, kingdoms and states have their several bounds : many sovereignties are contained in Christendom, whereas the Church is, by God's ordinance, one visible society of all Christians ; now it is manifest, first, that there are some things which equally concern the whole Church and all parts of it : secondly, *that in things which concern the whole Church, no part thereof, in any state or kingdom, can be concluded by that state or kingdom.*"—Right of the Church in a Christian State, chap. 1, § 43. Oxford 1844.

Again, in another place, he says :

“ For seeing there is, by this determination, no manner of coercive power in the Church, but all in the state—for excommunication constrains but upon supposition that a man resolves to be a Christian—there remains but one head in the civil society of every state, so absolute over the persons that make the Church, that the independent power thereof in Church matters will enable it to do nothing against, but suffer all things from, the sovereign. And yet so absolute, and depending on God alone in Church matters, that if a sovereign professing Christianity, should not only forbid the profession of that faith, or the exercise of those ordinances which God hath required to be served with ; but even the exercise of that ecclesiastical power which shall be necessary to preserve the unity of the Church, *it must needs be necessary for those that are trusted with the power of the Church, not only to disobey the commands of the sovereign, but to use that power which their quality in the society of the Church gives them to provide for the subsistence thereof, without the assistance of secular powers.*

A thing manifestly supposed by all the Bishops of the ancient Church, in all those actions wherein they refused to obey their emperors seduced by heretics, and to suffer their Churches to be regulated by them, to the prejudice of Christianity : particularly in that memorable refusal of Athanasius of Alexandria, and Alexander of Constantinople, to

admit the heretic Arius to communion, at the instant command of Constantine the Great: which most Christian action whosoever justifies not—beside the appearance of favour to such an heresy—he will lay the Church open to the same ruin, whensoever the sovereign power is seduced by the like. *And such a difference falling out, so that to particular persons it cannot be clear who is in the right, it will be requisite for Christians in a doubtful case, at their utmost perils to adhere to the guides of the Church against their lawful sovereigns, though to no further effect than to suffer for the exercise of Christianity, and the maintenance of the society of the Church in unity.*—Chap. iv. §§ 77, 78.

I have, already proved from authorities which are beyond suspicion, namely, Canonists and Jesuits, that the Catholic Church teaches the doctrine of obedience to the civil government.

I have also shown, on the authority of Divines of the Church of England that, in disputed cases, that church claims a like consideration with the just claims of the Catholic Faith. But while the claims of the Church of England are thus strongly asserted, the obedience commanded by the Catholic Church to be paid to the secular government on all civil and temporal questions, is not only more strongly enjoined, but also more definitely fixed. She utterly deprives by the denial of the right of private judgment, the more free interpretation which each member of the English Church may claim, when he wishes or thinks fit to refuse his legitimate obedience to the decrees of his government.

But I feel it may be said, that many of the authorities I have quoted do not apply to the now common case

of the throne, or seat of government being occupied by those not in communion with the Catholic Church. It would occupy too much space to detail the gradual growth, extent, and decay of the opinions which formerly prevailed, and very generally, with respect to the non-necessity of obedience to those out of the pale of the Church. They never were matters of faith, if they had been they could not have been altered—they were opinions only; and the Church was encouraged to assert them through the weak and too ready acquiescence of the civil power. Even now that principle is admitted by the laws of England. The right to the crown is now confined to a Protestant. Cardinal Bellarmine taught that a king, falling into heresy, should forfeit his crown. The Protestant Parliament of England, at the “glorious and immortal Revolution,” declares that the British sovereign shall lose the crown, if he shall adopt the faith of the Church of Rome.^(a)

It may not be inadvisable to insert here an extract from

(a) And, whereas, it hath been found by experience, that it is inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant kingdom, to be governed by a Popish prince or by any king or queen marrying a Papist, the said lords spiritual and temporal and commons, do further pray that it may be enacted, that all and every person and persons, that is, and are, or shall be reconciled to, or shall hold communion with, the See, or Church, of Rome, or shall profess the Popish religion, or shall marry a Papist, shall be excluded, and be for ever incapable to inherit, possess or enjoy the crown or government of this realm, and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging, or any part of the same, or to have, use, or exercise any regal power, authority, or jurisdiction within the same: and in all, and every such case or cases, *the people of these realms shall be, and are hereby, absolved of their allegiance*: and the said crown and government shall from time to time descend to and be enjoyed by such person or persons, being Protestants, as should have inherited and enjoyed the same in case the said person or persons so reconciled, holding communion, or professing, or marrying as aforesaid, were naturally dead.”—1 Will. & Mar. ch. 2.

instructions to soldiers and sailors, serving in her Majesty's armies and fleets, contained in a prayer book published by proper Ecclesiastical authority,—an extract which shows that the Catholic soldier or sailor feels himself relieved from that individual responsibility which those who maintain the right of private judgment may not improbably be unwilling to trust to the opinions of other men.

“ Civilians, in Great Britain, are not obliged to adopt the profession of arms, or to enlist into the army, if they do not please it themselves. While Civilians, they have a power and a right, to analyse the justice of such or such a war, and to consider it in all its relations, both as regard religion, conscience, or its political effects upon society. But, once enlisted, they resign this right and power, and contract an obligation of obedience to the orders they receive from their officers in command; unless in some particular case, when they may be called upon, *to act contrary to the evident law of God*, from whose law, all human laws derive their force and origin. It is, however, to be observed, that in resigning their right and liberty to discuss the justice of the war, or service in which they are engaged, they also cease to have any responsibility on that head before God, their only responsibility now being, their own individual good conduct, fidelity to their sworn obligations, loyalty to their prince, and fortitude and valour in the hour of trial: and all this is sure to be observed by the truly Christian soldier.”

In the second place, I describe the duties which are incumbent upon the Pope, the bishops, and the priests of the Catholic Church in their relations with the laity of that Church.

I do not think it can be necessary for me to say much upon this subject: but such is the ignorance of many in

its regard, that I feel I should be wrong in omitting all mention of it. The Pope, notwithstanding his wonderful position, his exalted rank—being no less than the Vicar of Christ upon earth—is still a man. He is the successor of the holy Apostle St. Peter, the first called to the sacred ministry of the New Covenant; he alone is entrusted with the keys of the kingdom of heaven; yet, notwithstanding all his high prerogatives, he is a mere man like ourselves. He, to whom it is given to dispense the spiritual treasures of the Church of Christ, is, like the meanest Catholic, a poor sinner. He is bound to all the duties exacted from each of his flock. He must confess, in humble penitence, his sins of commission and his sins of omission, and perform the penance assigned him, though he is the temporal sovereign of a great part of Italy. From the mouth of a priest, possibly a poor mendicant friar, the Vicar of Christ must receive spiritual consolation, and that absolution which is only ratified in heaven when bestowed upon a penitent and contrite heart.

If the Pope suffers himself, for earthly considerations, to be swayed from his high path of duty; if he permits the little ones of his flock, scattered as it is over the whole world, to be betrayed through his negligence, if he does not drive away strange doctrines from the schools, then truly he may tremble when called before the awful judgment seat of his offended God.

Remember that it is not in his power to alter in any, the least degree, that faith of which he is the commissioned guardian, nor to teach evil to be good or good to be evil, or to dispense, in any case, with the immutable conditions

of the divine law, as revealed by God to man. Let kings and rulers, then, forbear to press upon the conscience of the great, as well as upon that of the poor.

The duties of the bishops and priests are, each in his proper sphere, the same as those of the Head of the Church.

Thirdly. The reciprocal duties which are owed by Catholics and their fellow-citizens, being without the Catholic Church.

I have shown that the spiritual allegiance which I, as a Catholic, owe to the Pope, the supreme head of the Catholic Church, is perfectly compatible with my civil allegiance to my sovereign. I have likewise stated the duties which the Pope owes to all the members of the Catholic Church—the shepherd to his flock. It remains for me to treat of the reciprocal duties which exist between the Catholics of this kingdom, and their fellow-citizens without the Church.

Every society consists of individuals collected together, for the purposes of mutual assistance and support. In ordinary cases, a man finds himself born in a certain kingdom or state, governed by certain laws, regulated by certain customs. He is bound from his entrance into the society of those amongst whom it has pleased Providence that his lot should be cast, to certain duties. He is bound, whatever may be his creed, to brotherly love, mutual assistance, to do all that lies in his power to be of service to all around him. His religious faith, if he be a Catholic, commands him in the strongest manner to the exercise of all

charity. He must love his fellow-men for the sake of their common Creator. He is not merely bound to assist, with his purse, the wants of those who are oppressed by poverty, but he must, as far as it may be possible for him to do so, alleviate the mental distresses of his fellow-creatures, abstain from all that may scandalize them, make light of their faults, forgive them if they do him injury; and all this for the sake of Christ, their common Redeemer, who himself has taught us, in the parable of the heretical Samaritan, that difference of religious faith ought to be no hindrance to the dictates of universal charity. . These are the duties of religion.

But there are also political obligations, which are not the less required by the virtue of charity. He is bound to inflict no unnecessary restriction on the liberties of his fellow-man. He is bound to respect his neighbour's conscience, as well as his property. If his brother appears to him to be in error, even on the most vital of all points, he is bound (the opportunity offering) to place the truth before him with charity and forbearance. The more fervent he is in his own religion, the more tolerant should he be of the fervour of others. The more carefully he examines his own mind, and the processes by which he has arrived at the height of his convictions, the more will he be inclined to estimate and to compassionate the doubts and struggles in the mind of his brother. I do not wish to draw any invidious contrast between the duties prescribed by my own faith, and that of others. I

merely state, and shortly, that which is prescribed by mine. Let us now look at the other side of the question.

There are upon the Statute books, laws which interfere with the free exercise of our Christian liberty. There are laws against the religious orders of our Church. Those great examples of Christian perfection, the members of the monastic institutions, who have formed themselves into communities, for no political or earthly purpose, but for the practice of the counsels of evangelical perfection, are interdicted by the laws of the state. Those who seek to chastise their bodies, and keep them in subjection, following the example of St. Paul; those who seek to bridle the tongue, in compliance with the precept of St. James—such are the men who, if they exist in England, exist in contravention of law. I will not enter, it would detain me too long, upon their countless sacrifices, their constant self-denial. By them the poor are fed, prayers are daily and nightly offered, for their friends and for their enemies, for the Church, and for their country which disowns them.

How shall I detail the difficulties that daily present themselves to the Catholic priests in the execution of their spiritual duties. I do not speak of slights and insults, sometimes intended, sometimes given through complete misapprehension. But I speak of those difficulties of daily occurrence in the prison, in the workhouse, and in the hospital which really and practically impede their exertions, and

which too often send the unshriven soul to his dread account. Take, for instance, a prison in which there are Catholics. If we inquire of any of them their religion, we shall have most likely the following answer: "Religion! what use is religion to me? I have none. My parents were honest people. They were Catholics—too poor to give me education. They made me, it is true, when I was old enough, go to confession and receive the Sacrament, but I never went again. They died, and I was left an orphan on the world. I took to bad courses, and here I am. I do not wish to mend. I shall soon be here again after I am let out. Priest, no—no priest comes to me. He cannot come unless I ask for him, and I do not want to be annoyed. The chaplain of the prison comes to me, but what is the use of him? My father and mother were attended by a priest, and I will never have a parson. I do not want a priest either." Such a speech might be heard in any prison, for the very man who most requires spiritual consolation is the one least likely to demand it; and unless he does demand it, there is no rule by which the priest can insist upon attending him. Consequently, the prisoner, whose very nature might have been changed by the gentle instruction and paternal counsels of an experienced confessor, is turned adrift again, and soon returns more hardened than before. Let the political economist calculate the additional burden on the country. Let the religious Statesman ask himself, How many

souls are now in hell through the existence of these bad prison regulations?

Let us now turn from the guilty prisoner, to the innocent, but unfortunate, inmate of the workhouse. There is a poor Catholic woman whose hours in this world are few. There are many in the same room. She is old, and feeble, and deaf. The master and mistress of the Union hate "Papists." The mistress will give no aid to the "Romish Priest," in his "senseless mummery." He is obliged to speak to her so low, that it is hardly possible, (even under the shelter of the torn counterpane he has with difficulty obtained as a screen), but that some of the by-standers should hear. At all events she fears it, and perhaps her last minutes are so near that her strength fails her; and, her confession incomplete, she is sent before her Creator, to plead at His judgment-seat her inability to attend the services of her Church out of the workhouse, and to state, that by the laws of her country, no provision was made for such services within its walls, although there were many Catholics who were similarly circumstanced. In the hospital, scenes not very different frequently occur. Vexatious regulations are made by committees, who have, perhaps, not one Catholic amongst them, and who, through want of knowledge, frequently make most unsatisfactory rules without intending to act harshly or unjustly. I will not enter upon many other circumstances, most distressing to persons of tender conscience, such as explanations unnecessarily given in their presence, of

Church doctrines at variance with their own,—pamphlets handed about in sick wards, containing words of injurious import to their faith. I pass over these and many other burdens, under which the poor Catholics of this country are doomed to groan. I know that some of the cases I have mentioned, are beyond the power of government, though many are within its power and its duties.

The former cases I mention as an appeal of earnest entreaty to any one who reads these lines, to consider, in his inmost heart, whether he cannot, in some one institution to which he belongs, extend a charitable consideration in favour of the poor Catholics and their hardworking priests. And if but one kind word be spoken, one gentle deed done, then may the blessing of Almighty God descend upon the head of him who does it, and may the prayers of the poor await him in this world and the next.

There are three classes of our community, in particular, subject to great inconvenience and distress. I allude to soldiers, sailors, and servants. As regards the first, it would probably be a fair calculation if we put the number of Catholic soldiers in the British Army at a third. Now, if I am correct in this, the number of Catholic soldiers must be above 30,000. Without referring to the difficulties which exist, but which the Government of the country ought to remedy; the want of Catholic chaplains at the military stations, and on foreign service, is the most ur-

gent. The regulations of the Regimental Schools are drawn up with the most entire disregard of the conscientious feelings of Catholic soldiers.

I am not aware what proportion the Catholic sailors may bear to the others; it is probably not large. Whatever it may be, officers commanding ships in her Majesty's navy, might be instructed to cause the Catholic sailors, when unable to attend mass ashore, to have such facilities for the performance of their religious duties as may be practicable. It is to be observed, that by the inviolable discipline of the Church, it is forbidden for any Catholic to join in prayer with those without her pale. It is a mere mockery to insist upon compliance with rules, which only induce contempt in the mind of the unwilling attendant at a prohibited service. We know well the difficulty that any one, not especially gifted with a devout spirit, feels in paying due attention to his religious exercises. Is it probable, therefore, that any good can arise from a forced attendance at a service in which the heart is forbidden to join, and the ear unwilling to listen?

Catholic servants, also, are often placed in most embarrassing positions. Their masters and mistresses are not aware of the strict rule which forbids them from sharing in their own devotions, and they attribute to sulky indifference that which proceeds from a deep sense of truth. In all these classes, it must be remembered, that the force of what the French call "*respect humain*," is not less than it is in the higher classes,

where numbers every day unhappily break through the obligations of duty, through the fatal effects of human pride.

If I have said a word that can offend any of my Protestant brethren, I sincerely regret it, and I would say to them, that I am willing to give to all, the liberty I claim for myself, or rather for my poorer Catholic brethren. Dream not of "Papistical plots," "Jesuitical contrivances." Fancy not that those among you who have entered the Catholic Church have been urged by other than their own conscientious convictions; and that frequently—too frequently—at the sacrifice of all that this world holds most dear. Doubt not that he who now ventures to address you, is as anxious as any amongst you for the glory, the happiness, and the honour of England. His earnest prayer is, that the reign of Queen Victoria may be long, happy, and glorious; that her children, and her children's children, may inherit her throne and her virtues. And if the humble prayers of the author of these hasty lines be offered for the conversion of his country, regard it as no insult, nor any short-coming of love: rather look upon them as incense offered on the altar of charity, the first duty of a Christian to the God of all love.







